



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 31, 2018

Ms. Josette Flores
Assistant City Attorney
City of El Paso
P.O. Box 1890
El Paso, Texas 79950-1890

OR2018-02178

Dear Ms. Flores:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 700138 (City Case No. 18-1018-156).

The City of El Paso (the "city") received a request for all animal service reports involving a specified address, the requestor, or two other named individuals. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the instant request because it does not involve the specified address, the requestor, or the other named individuals. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request, and the city is not required to release such information in response to this request.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the common-law informer's privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who

report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority. *See* Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer's privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." Open Records Decision No. 279 at 1-2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton Rev. Ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988). However, witnesses who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make a report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer's privilege. Additionally, the privilege is not intended to protect the identities of public officials and employees who have a duty to report violations of the law. Because a public employee acts within the scope of his employment when filing a complaint, the informer's privilege does not protect the public employee's identity. *Cf. United States v. St. Regis Paper Co.*, 328 F. Supp. 660,665 (W.D. Wis. 1971) (concluding public officer may not claim informer's reward for service it is his or her official duty to perform). We note the informer's privilege does not apply where the informant's identity is known to the individual who is the subject of the complaint. *See* ORD 208 at 1-2.

You state the submitted information identifies complainants who reported possible violations of section 7.08.030 of the city code to the city's police department and/or the city's code enforcement personnel. You explain the alleged violations are misdemeanors punishable by fine. You also inform us that you have no indication that the subjects of the complaints know the identities of the complainants. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the city may withhold the responsive identifying information of the complainants, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 156 (1977) (name of person who makes complaint about another individual to city's animal control division is excepted from disclosure by informer's privilege so long as information furnished discloses potential violation of state law). The city must release the remaining responsive information.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open_orl_ruling_info.shtml, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tim Neal". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "T" and "N".

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/tdw

Ref: ID# 700138

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)